DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 806 EA 032 785

AUTHOR	Newkirk, Catherine Elaine Parker; Klotz, Jack
TITLE	Teacher Self-Efficacy and Site-Based Management as a Decentralization Strategy.
PUB DATE	2002-11-00
NOTE	51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (31st, Chattanooga, TN, November 6-9, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Decentralization; Educational Environment; Instructional Effectiveness; Instructional Improvement; Occupational Information; *School Based Management; School Culture; School Organization; School Policy; Secondary Education; *Self Efficacy; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study to determine if teacher self-efficacy in site-based managed schools differed from teacher self-efficacy in schools that were not site-based managed. The study also examined whether there was a relationship between self-efficacy in site-based managed schools and schools that were not site-based managed in regards to age, gender, years of teaching experience, years at present school, grade-level assignment, and education degree of teachers. Participants in the study were about 100 teachers from two secondary site-based managed schools and about 100 teachers from two secondary schools that were not site-based managed in South Mississippi. Data were collected from a researcher-designed instrument (included in the report). Analysis of the data showed that teachers in site-based managed schools had a higher level of teacher self-efficacy than teachers in the other schools. Analysis also showed that there was a significant difference in self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and teachers in the other schools relative to their influence on the variables of curriculum, school resources, and disciplinary procedures. There was not a significant difference in self-efficacy among teachers relative to their influence on the variable of instruction. (Contains 46 references.) (WFA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 806

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Site-Based Management

As A Decentralization Strategy

Catherine Elaine Parker Newkirk, Ph.D.

The University of Southern Mississippi

Jack Klotz, Ph.D.

The University of Central Arkansas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Klotz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 032 785

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association in Chattanooga, Tennessee , November 6-9, 2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

The debate over the issue of how to best educate students has been a controversy among educators and others for many years. Schools and educators have been harshly criticized. The public has called for change. In 1983 the United States Department of Education released A Nation At Risk. The report described our schools as ineffective and substandard. It targeted the quality of education and compared American schools to other advanced nations. American educational institutions were portrayed as inferior and inadequate for such a nation as the United States.

Since the publication of A Nation At Risk in 1983, school systems have been striving to improve and reform their institutions. As a result of the publications of this report, the educational reform movement in America began. This reform movement affected the manner in which institutions across the country conducted their business. Darling-Hammond (1992) stated:

> Educators have been called upon to rethink how schools are designed, how school systems operate, how teaching and learning are pursued, and what goals for schooling are sought.

A huge resurgence of school initiatives has caused many changes in educational systems and also in the manner in which they function. Educational institutions have been involved in restructuring in order to turn the tide of criticism. Among the many initiatives for restructuring and reforming is the strategy of site-based management. Among its many possible benefits is the notion of autonomy and increased

teacher self-efficacy. Jones (1997) suggested that participatory decision-making would lead to more effective organizations and higher staff morale. Lashway (1997) believed that the primary purpose of shared decision-making was to improve teaching and learning, to increase job satisfaction, and to create a new form of leadership.

Research by Riggs and Enochs (1990) suggested that teachers with high levels of teacher efficacy anticipate they will be successful. They were more likely to try out new teaching ideas and their willingness to innovate was reflected in high student achievement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if teacher self-efficacy in two secondary site-based managed schools differed from teacher self-efficacy in two secondary non-site-based managed schools. In addition, the study examined whether there was a relationship between teacher self efficacy in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools in regards to age, gender, years of teaching experience, years at present school, grade level assignment, and educational degree of teachers. A final purpose of the study was to present descriptive data relative to the previously identified variables of the study.

Hypotheses

This study examined the following hypotheses with respect to the afore mentioned variables:

H_1: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and teachers in non-site- based managed schools differ in relation to influence on curriculum.

H_2: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differ in relation to influence on school resources.

H_3: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differ in relation to influence on instruction.

H_4: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differ in relation to disciplinary procedures.

H_5: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site based managed schools differ in relation to age and gender of the teacher.

H_6: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differ in relation to educational degrees, years of teaching experience, years of teaching at present school, and grade level assignment.

Justification for the Study

The need for education systems to facilitate means for increasing student learning and achievement has been on the front burner of America for many decades. Schools exist to promote student learning and achievement. Educators and others have focused on ways to promote effective schools for many years.

In 1983 the President's National Commission on Excellence in Education issued A Nation at Risk. A major emphasis of this report was on teachers and how they prepared students for future roles in society. Researchers involved in the education reform movement have focused on initiatives such as site-based management and high teacher self-efficacy as possible tools to remedy the education dilemma. Both of these initiatives emphasized the impact of the idea that those closest to students can have a positive effect on student learning and increase student achievement.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presented a review of literature relating to decentralization (site based management, shared decision-making, participatory management) and teacher self efficacy. The literature reviewed also provided an overview of other relevant topics such as the educational reform movement, school culture, student achievement and teacher perception of site-based management. Both site-based management and teacher self-efficacy were important elements in the promotion of effective schools and increasing student learning. Research reported that site-based management was an effective strategy for improving educational systems (Cohen, 1989). Researchers Gibson and Dembo (1984) have reported that the higher a teacher's sense of efficacy, the more successful the teacher would be in promoting student achievement. The final section of the chapter reviewed research regarding the impact of teacher efficacy and site-based management on restructuring schools and improving student learning. The advantages and disadvantages of site-based management were also discussed.

Historical Background of the Educational Reform Movement

The roots of educational reform go deep. The early beginnings of reform were often viewed as cyclical. Every ten years or so some group would yell fire. It was a way of saying, " let's do something different." In the early 1980's a concerted effort to reform American education began. The impetus was primarily economic. People from all walks of life concluded that America was on the verge of being displaced as a major player in the world economy (Finn and Rebarber 1992). It did not take policymakers long to draw a connection between this economic situation and the educational system. The idea for schooling to restore America's economic preeminence was not ignored. Sinking

economic productivity, national debt, international commercial competition, trade deficits, and a declining dollar placed the nation in increasing economic jeopardy. Schooling was seen as part of the problem and part of the solution.

After the publication of A Nation at Risk, the drive to reshape the nation's schools was viewed as a one-time activity. This "one time" activity would solve all the problems and then disappear. In a study by Lashway (1999) it was found that the nature of school reform needed to be changed from top-down mandates to ones that involved those not traditionally involved in the decision-making process. Educational leaders were in the process of restructuring education. Educators, parents, and concerned others have sent out cries for change in what schools do, how they do it, and how they measure it. Educational reform may be thought of as an aggressive battle to find meaningful ways to produce better students. The quest to produce improved achievement among students has been an ongoing one.

For several decades educational systems have implemented some form of school reform activities in an effort to increase student's academic achievement. However, the problem of declining school performance continues to increase. There was cause for alarm regarding the current status of educational reform in many American schools across the country. This opinion was evident in an education manifesto by the Center for Education Reform of April 30, 1998. It stated that:

> Over 10 million Americans have reached the 12th grade not even having learned to read at the basic level. Over 20 million Americans have reached their senior year unable to do basic math. Almost 25 million have reached the 12th grade not knowing the essentials of U.S. History, and those are the young people who

> complete their senior year. In the same period, over 6 million Americans dropped out of high school altogether. The numbers are even bleaker in minority communities. (p.1)

Criticisms of educational reform in America's schools reached a point of enormous concern for many people. The public called for change. Linda Darling-Hammond (1997) stated that:

> Despite many serious efforts at school reform, the nation is little closer to attaining its educational goals than it was a decade ago. Policy makers are just beginning to realize that most schools and teachers cannot provide the kind of teaching for all students that new standards demand, not because they do not want to but because they do not know how, and the systems in which they work do not support them in doing so. The policy challenge ahead is to develop schools' capacity to teach challenging content to diverse learners by ensuring teachers access to the knowledge they need to be effective and by developing new organizational reforms that can support more powerful teaching and learning. (pp.151-152)

Site-Based Management

Site-based management (SBM) has emerged as one of the most popular strategies of the educational reform movement. Site-based management involved shifting the decision-making authority from school district central offices to individual school sites. This strategy was meant to bring decision-making closer to those who educate students and thereby improve public education. This improved education included improvement of teacher performance and thereby the ultimate goal of increase in student learning. A

growing body of research by the private sector on the benefits of participatory decision-making led school leaders to believe that site-based management was a promising strategy for improving the quality of education because it engages those closest to the action (Cohen, 1989). Those closest to the action were administrators, teachers, students, parents and the community. They were all stakeholders and embraced the process in order for it to be successful. Site-based management, shared decision-making, collaborative management, participatory management and empowerment were targeted as the new cure for what ailed education (Goens, 1996). All had in common the aspect of providing input from those concerned with the improvement of school and thereby the production of successful students. For purposes of this study, the term site-based management was used to mean all of the above buzzwords.

Organizations such as the American Association of School Administrators and the National Education Association pushed for the adoption of site-based management as a means of improving achievement for students. Many local school districts as well as states embraced site-based management as an important tool for improvement of their school and a means of producing effective students (Liontos, 1994).

SBM involved fundamental changes in the way schools were managed and involved the alteration of the roles and relationships of those who made up the organization. In SBM the process, educational decisions were made in a collaborative manner at the school level. It took many forms. The roles of administrators, teachers, students, parents, and community came together to brainstorm techniques, skills and complex concepts. Although it took many forms, it emphasized several common beliefs (Liontos, 1994). One common belief was that those closest to the students would make

the best decisions about the student's education. A second belief was that teachers, parents and school staff should have more input about policies and programs affecting their schools and children. The third belief was that those responsible for carrying out decisions should have a voice in determining those decisions. All of these beliefs would be effective and lasting only if those who implemented SBM felt a sense of ownership and dedication to the process. Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (1995) concluded that the bottom line purpose of site-based management was to improve school effectiveness and thereby increase student learning. It served to ensure that schools were more responsible to the needs of the students and the community. The process could not be done once. It has been an ongoing endeavor.

David (1995) reported that site-based management was basically an attempt to transform schools into communities where the appropriate people participated constructively in decisions that affect student learning. It was a potential force for empowering educators and the community. Site-based management could be one of the most significant reforms of this time, but no two people totally agreed on what it was, how it was done, or why it was done. Site-based management has been noteworthy to many educators.

David (1995) had also reported that most variants of site-based management involved some type of representation decision-making council at the school site. The council shared authority with the principal or might be in an advisory position to the principal. Some councils had more power. These included the power to hire and fire. Other councils could hire personnel when there were vacancies. The composition of the council was varied according to the particular education site. In addition to principals,

parents, teachers, and students the council could include classified staff and business representatives.

Rationale for Site-Based Management

One rationale of site-based management was that it improved school effectiveness and student learning by increasing staff commitment. The process of creating effective schools and student success should not be dependent on just the top administrator. Decision- making should be the product of collaboration. That is, a mutually beneficial relationship between two or more parties that works toward common goals by sharing responsibility, authority and accountability for achieving results (Smith, 1999).

There were many other reasons for initiating site-based management. All were surrounded by language aimed at increasing student achievement. For some, site-based management was reform designed to shift the balance of authority among schools, districts, and states. David (1995) reported that this tended to be the rationale behind state effort rather than district reforms. It was also often part of a larger reform that claimed to trade school autonomy for accountability to the state. Some educators saw site-based management as a political reform initiated to broaden the decision- making base either within the school and/or community. Other educators believed that site-based management might also be an administrative reform to make management more efficient by decentralizing and deregulating it. This served to accomplish the ultimate goal of student learning. Assumptions regarding site-based management were relevant to understanding the process. Examples of those assumptions were discussed in the next paragraphs.

According to Miller (1995) some assumptions about the effects of site-based management included the following statements:

(1) Site-based management will produce better decisions on curricular and pedagogical matters.

(2) Teachers know students better than administrators do.

(3) Site-based management promotes reform and innovation by unleashing teachers' creativity.

(4) Site-based management fills the teachers' need to have some control over their work lives, and because of these and other advantages, it will lead to improved student achievement.

Research by Fullan (1998) presented a very clear finding that student achievement increased substantially in schools with collaborative work cultures that foster a professional learning community between teachers and others. The continuous focus on improving instructional practices in light of student performance data and link to external standards and staff support was also significant.

School Culture and Site-Based Management

The field of education lacked a clear and consistent definition of school culture. The term has been used synonymously with a variety of concepts, including "climate," "ethos," and "saga." The concept of culture came to education from the corporate workplace with the notion that it would provide direction for a more efficient and stable learning environment. Deal and Peterson (1990) noted that the definition of culture includes "deep patterns of values, beliefs, and traditions that have been formed over the course of the school's history."

New cultural changes emerged under one of three conditions: (1) when a new organization was launched, (2) when an existing organization was opened to cultural evolution or (3) when a crisis forced an organization to examine its traditional ways (Deal and Peterson, 1999). These conditions were reflected in research conducted in schools that exemplified excellence in schools. Deal and Peterson (1999) looked at four exemplary schools across the country. Common to all four schools were commitment to student learning, pride in physical environment, staff input into site decision-making and quality teachers. All of these elements were connected to high teacher self-efficacy and increase in student learning.

Heckman (1993) reminded us that school culture lay in "the commonly held beliefs of teachers, students, and principals." These definitions went beyond the business of creating an efficient learning environment. They focused more on the core values necessary to teach and influence young minds. Another researcher, Brooks (2001) stated that when properly implemented, site-based management could result in significant positive changes that profoundly affected the schools' culture. Further, she purported that by empowering school staff, parents, and community through involvement in decision making site-based managed schools could bring about thoughtful and effective change. Schools in which decisions were based upon sensitivity to the community and which capitalized on available resources were places where children and the adults who worked with them succeeded.

Purkey and Marshall (1982) defined the school's culture as "a structure, process and climate of values and norms that channel staff and students in the direction of successful teaching and learning." Saphier and King (1985) noted the norms of school

culture, which, if strong, contributed to the instructional effectiveness of a school. Effective site-based managed schools were those which represented the organization-wide pattern of getting things done, high expectations, trust and confidence, tangible support, appreciation and recognition as well as honest, open communication contributed to the instructional effectiveness of schools.

Deal and Peterson (1999) stated that there were specific elements that promoted positive, successful cultures. They included the following:

(1) A mission focused on student and teacher learning

(2) A rich sense of history and purpose

(3) Core values of collegiality, performance, and improvement that engendered quality, achievement and learning for everyone

(4) Positive beliefs and assumptions about the potential of students and staff to learn and grow

(5) A strong professional community that uses knowledge, experience, and research to improve practice

(6) Shared leadership that balanced continuity and improvement

(7) An informal network that fostered positive communication flow

(8) Shared leadership that balanced continuity and improvement

(9) Rituals and ceremonies that reinforced core culture values

(10) Stories that celebrated success and recognized heroine and heroes

(11) A physical environment that symbolized job and pride

(12) A widely shared sense of respect and caring for everyone (p. 116)

The philosophy behind these elements was that each school found its own path and shaped culture over a period. Each school utilized this time in a variety of ways to develop its path and shape its culture. Thus, it was the combination of positive, successful elements of culture woven together by actions and reflections of school leaders and staff that produced effective schools.

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (2001) suggested that site-based management was a significant reform initiative that promised to place more authority in individual schools through the adoption of a more democratic decision-making process. Although the forms and methods of site-based management varied, the primary goal was typically the same, to shift authority away from the district administrative hierarchy and into the hands of school groups such as teachers and parents that were more closely connected to the school and better equipped to meet the specialized needs of students. This degree of school reformation required a shift in the school culture.

Site-based management's potential to enable comprehensive reform held promise for schools and districts seeking to improve the educational system and help students reach higher levels of achievement. However, before implementing site-based management, districts needed to ensure they had the support of all stakeholders, a well-defined vision, and the time and training for implementation.

Student Achievement

At the helm of school reform was the idea to increase student performance. Despite all of the variations in rationale for site-based management, its main stated objective was to enhance student achievement. Advocates of site-based management

believed that student performance was likely to improve when educational management was centered at the school site rather than at the district level. They believed that teachers and principals were more sensitive to the needs of particular schools and students than were central office administrators. Allowing those closest to students on a daily basis to be involved in decision-making seemed to produce a positive focus for all involved. Researchers such as Dembo and Gibson (1985) stated that the extent which teachers believe that they could affect student learning could influence teacher/student interactions and the success of the teacher's efforts in facilitating gains in student achievement. Educators with high teaching self-efficacy engaged in activities that encouraged development of student competencies.

Gibson and Dembo (1984) stated that the higher a teacher's sense of efficacy, the more successful that teacher would be in promoting desirable student outcomes. According to David (1989), even sound educational reforms faltered if the teachers were expected to implement them and had not participated in planning them. White (1989) believed that site-based management improved staff moral and communication, two critical variables in teacher performance and indirectly, student performance.

In order for site-based managed schools to facilitate student achievement, the process for meeting the change had to be developed. According to research by Marx, Hunter and Johnson (1997), schools established goals based on desired outcomes for students. Before initiating change, schools identified specific indicators for success. They defined success in order to clarify end goals and established an agreement between local stakeholders and the school district regarding the performance expectations. Specific indicators relating to student achievement included the following: standardized

test performance, grade point average, daily attendance, school dropout and retention rates, the acquisition of marketable skills by graduates and the ability of graduates to enroll in advanced training or become gainfully employed.

Site-Based Management and Raising Student Performance

The task of establishing a relationship between site-based management and student performance was problematic. As Malen and her colleagues (1990), indicated, very little quantitative research has been done on the topic. They argued that factors other than site-based management accounted for gains in student achievement made after instituting the reform. Research problems were also impacted by the absence of a standard definition for site-based management. Research did not always indicate to what extent schools had redistributed power.

Results of site-based management in some city schools were mixed. According to Murphy (1990) one large Maryland school district recorded significant and widespread improvements in test scores. This improvement was particularly evident among African-Americans after a five-step site-based plan was instituted at the school. However, Peterson (1991) reported that test scores for Dade County, Florida's inner-city schools have significantly declined after three years of school-based management.

Researchers such as Malen and her associates (1990) indicated that student performance at many site-based managed schools was directly affected by "piecemeal implementation." They reported that if those involved in the process were poorly trained, they were not able to affect improvement of student performance. Drury and Levin (1994) reported that site-based management contributed to four intermediate outcomes, which led to potential improved student achievement. They were increased efficiency in

use of resources and personnel, increased professionalism of teachers, implementation of curriculum reform and increased community engagement. According to Wohlsetter (1995), site-based managed schools that have combined the governance reform with an overall push for curriculum and instruction were high performing schools. This combination allowed stakeholders to concentrate on ways to improve student academic performance.

Although many studies had been conducted on site-based management and its impact on student performance, few attempted to evaluate quantitative data. Even fewer studies have reported a positive link between improved student performance and the site-based management process (Summer & Johnson, 1995). A study done by Taylor and Bogotch (1994) examined two groups of schools, eighteen with a process for site-based management and twenty without the process. The study yielded responses to a questionnaire from one thousand fifty four teachers from the participating schools. In order to determine any effects of site-based management, the researcher looked at the possibility that a teacher's participation might have positively affected student achievement. They used math scores from the Stanford Achievement Test to calculate gain/loss scores.

The process was done by subtracting the score for the school year before implementation of site-based management from data from the third year of implementation. The researchers found no correlation between involvement of teachers in site-based management and individual student performance. Research regarding student performance and the extent to which those schools that utilized site-based management attempt to measure its impact was inclusive. Little evidence was produced

to support the notion that site-based management had a positive impact on student performance. As a result, some educators believed that site-based management was a process that was merely cloaked in the language of increasing student achievement (David, 1995).

Teacher Efficacy

Efforts to respond to reports for failure of schooling in American propelled the initiation of educational reform. Restructuring efforts were initiated with great energy and determination. The first restructuring efforts to increase the quality and effectiveness of educational systems were composed public policy mandates and inducements.

Sergiovanni (1992) described the first wave of efforts as authoritarian, teacher centered, competitive, and it stressed uniform minimum standards, accountability. He further stated that it was single pathed and linear. The curriculum was measured, standardized and narrowed. The hallmark of the period was monitoring teacher and student output. There was little attention paid to critical thinking or reasoning. The efforts did little to change the functioning or the public perception of American schools.

The second wave of efforts to reform education systems came early in the 1990's. This wave of reform addressed fundamental transformation of the infrastructure of public schools. According to Sergiovanni 1992), this wave-embraced learner centered teaching, participation operation and collaboration and was multi-pathed. This period was characterized by attempts to increase democratic principles and approaches consistent with the current shared decision-making and site-based management focus. Although this wave was a monumental reform effort, little if any preparation of school personnel was made to meet this change. Lack of preparation for this innovation was evidenced

throughout the attempted reforms of the educational system. This failing had a substantive effect on the attribute of teacher efficacy (Enderlin-Lampe, 1997).

Definitions of Teacher Self-Efficacy

Teacher efficacy was defined in many ways. Many feel that the concept of teacher efficacy emerged from Bandura's (1977) work on the conceptualization of self-efficacy and personal efficacy. He stated that an efficacy expectation was the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce outcome.

Morin and Welsh (1991) defined self-efficacy as an individual's perception of how effectively one can perform specific behaviors. Gibson and Dembo (1984) defined self-efficacy in relation to teachers as teacher's evaluation of their abilities to bring about positive student change. Gibson and Dembo defined teacher self-efficacy as the extent to which teachers believe that they can affect student learning. Finally Naring (1990) defined teacher efficacy as a teacher's confidences in his or her ability to execute appropriate teacher behaviors to positively effect student outcomes.

The concept of teacher efficacy was a self-perception and not an objective measure of the effectiveness of a teacher. Teacher efficacy was the expectation of teachers that their efforts produced student learning. The majority of researchers distinguished two types of teacher efficacy, personal and general. Personal teaching efficacy corresponded to Bandura's (1997) construct of self-efficacy. Individuals who felt that they would be successful were more apt to be so. This was because they adopted challenging goals, tried harder to achieve them, persisted despite setbacks and developed coping skills to manage their emotional states. The construct also postulated that individuals who believed they would fail avoided making the effort because failure

threatened their self-esteem. The second type of teaching efficacy was general teaching efficacy. This type of teacher efficacy was one in which the belief that teachers were able to bring about student learning despite out-of-school constraints. General teaching efficacy was similar to Bandura's outcome expectancy. Outcome expectancy influences performance because people would not engage in an activity unless they believe it would have desirable results. General teaching efficacy referred to outcomes likely to be achieved by teachers in general, instead of outcomes likely to result from one's own actions. Teachers believed they were able to perform the actions thought to be productive.

Importance of Teacher Self-Efficacy

The extent of which teachers believed that they could affect student learning influenced teacher/student interactions and the success of teachers' efforts in facilitating gains in student achievement (Dembo and Gibson, 1985). Morin and Welsh (1991) corroborated the importance of teacher efficacy. They stated that educators with high teaching efficacy engaged in activities that encouraged the development of competencies. They also reported that teachers with low efficacy avoided engaging in those activities.

Research by Gibson and Dembo (1984) reported that the higher a teacher's sense of efficacy, the more successful that teacher would be in promoting desirable student outcomes. Their research also found that teachers' beliefs in their own abilities to teach students contributed to individual teacher differences in effectiveness.

One would predict that teachers who believed student learning could be influenced by effective teaching, and who also had confidence in their own teaching abilities, persisted longer, provided a greater academic focus in the classroom, and

exhibited different types of feedback than teachers who had lower expectations concerning their ability to influence student learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1994).

An interesting model of the teaching learning process was developed by Proctor (1984). It highlighted the importance of teacher expectations for student learning. The School Based Model for Teaching Expectations described the variables of schools and classrooms thought to be under the influence of educators. The variables of the model are:

(1) Student characteristics (race, social class, prior achievement)

(2) School climate (attitudes, norms, beliefs, practices)

(3) Teacher expectations (sense of efficacy)

(4) School (interactions of instructional input, instructional feedback and personal communication)

(5) Intermediate outcomes (learning opportunities: academic learning time and curriculum coverage, student self-expectation)

(6) Student achievement (increase in student learning). (p. 469)

Each variable played an important part in the overall scheme of reaching increased student learning.

Proctor (1984) reported that in the early years of schooling, teacher expectations were not yet based on documented performance or performance that changed from one year to the next. During this time it appeared that teacher expectations produced achievement variations among students. Teacher expectations generally sustained, solidified and magnified preexisting achievement differences as children progressed into

later childhood and adolescence. According to Ashton (1984) research showed that there were two components to teacher expectations.

(1) The teacher believed that, in general, students could learn the material.

(2) The teacher believed that these particular students learned under his or her direction.

Teacher efficacy replaced the term teacher expectations. According to Ashton there were eight dimensions to the development of teacher efficacy. They are as follows:

(1) A sense of personal accomplishment: Teachers viewed work as meaningful and important.

(2) Positive expectations for student behavior: Teachers expected students to make progress.

(3) Personal responsibility for student learning: Teachers accepted accountability and displayed a willingness to evaluate performance.

(4) Strategies for achieving objectives: Teacher planned for student learning, sets personal goals, and identified strategies for achievement.

(5) Positive affect: Teachers felt good about teaching, self and students.

(6) Sense of control: Teachers believed they could influence student's learning.

(7) Sense of common teacher/student goals: Teachers developed joint ventures with students to accomplish goals.

(8) Democratic decision-making: Teachers involved students in decision-making aspects regarding goals and strategies. (p. 28)

Each dimension served as a level of advancement towards increased belief in the teacher's ability to impact student outcomes in a positive manner. High teacher self-efficacy yielded expectations of increased student learning. Teachers' high expectations transferred to increased student achievement.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Restructuring Schools

According to Ross (1994), self-efficacy has been a critical component in the restructuring of schooling. He asserted that there was a lack of clarity regarding role expectations and aspirations of teachers regarding decision-making. This resulted in a lack of general and personal self-efficacy in the workplace. Recent research of the literature supported the focus on teacher attributes of self-efficacy as a major factor in effective schooling. Enderlin-Lampre (1997) reported that a teacher's competency and self-efficacy greatly affected the teacher-student relationship and was at the heart of reform.

Research also indicated that teachers frequently believed that they were not competent to have an integral part in shared governance. Findings regarding teacher attitudes toward efficacy and empowerment and the learning environment in their schools indicated that teachers wanted to be involved in the restructuring of education. Although they were desirous of having a role in shared decision-making, they attributed an increased sense of efficacy, more positive attitudes and work environment to the following: supportive administration, collegial faculty, and a major focus on students. In order to bring about a collaborative work environment supportive of shared decision-making, the leader embraced and promoted the concept of empowerment and teacher efficacy by providing the opportunity for teachers to mutually determine the direction of

the organization. Although there were positive results of shared decision making, there was also a great deal of frustration and confusion, which resulted in increased teacher alienation (Enderlin-Lampre, 1997).

Site-Based Management and Teacher Self-Efficacy

One of the main premises of site-based management was that those closest to students knew best how to affect improvement in academic performance. Included in this premise was the assumption that the involvement of teachers in decisions related to student performance was essential.

Researchers such as Dunnett, Campbell, and Hakel (1967) connected school improvement to teachers. In this study it was stated that hiring high quality teachers and those who were motivated as well as prepared for the teaching task was crucial.

Studies by Odden and Wohlstetter (1995) reported schools that flourished under site-based management empower teachers. Teachers were able to have genuine authority over school decisions including curriculum and other factors that directly affected teaching and learning. The most persuasive element in favor of site-based management was the assumption that the basic control of pedagogical knowledge should be left to teachers since it was through them that school effectiveness and student achievement improved (Liontos, 1994).

Weiss (1993) reported that educators' belief that teachers familiarity with student issues was a basis for them to have input into the process. The decision-making process should be steered away from an administrative, bureaucratic focus toward issues related to curriculum and student achievement. Teachers' status as experts when dealing with

issues of teaching and learning also served to help the success of the process. Finally, site-based management unleashed teacher creativity (Weiss, 1993).

Site-Based Management and Teacher Views

It was the belief of those who advocate site-based management that teachers held the key to what was needed to improve student learning. Researchers examined how much control teachers believed they had over various aspects of school policy and over their classroom. One such study by the U. S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics was conducted in 1990-91. The research used data from the Schools and Staffing Survey to collect information from more than 53,000 public and private school teachers. Results from the survey reported that teachers did not believe they had much control over school policy areas such as discipline, in-service programs, ability grouping and curriculum. They did feel that they had control of classroom practices such as selecting teaching techniques, evaluating and grading students, and determining the amount of homework. The data reflected teachers' reports of conditions and not independent observations of actual decision-making. These were the views of those closest to the educational process and who were perhaps in the best position to know what the school conditions actually were (OERI, 1994).

Research conducted by Thomas (1995) looked at teachers' perceptions concerning the impact of site-based management on student achievement. Thirty teachers in the Chicago schools were surveyed. They indicated that students were not improving in areas of reading or mathematics. Weiss (1993) looked at twelve schools, six with site-based management and six without site-based management. Data collected from various school administrators, teachers and other staff members showed that there

was little support for the belief that site-based management was justified by its disposition for turning schools' attention to teaching, learning and student issues. Actually, schools with and without site-based management devoted almost an equal amount of emphasis on issues that might impact student achievement.

In another study research by Ramey and Dornseif (1994) examined responses from teachers in nineteen site-based managed schools in 1992 and teachers in thirteen site-based managed schools in 1993. The responses were from a questionnaire targeted at calculating a score to indicate the extent of teacher participation in decision-making. An overall achievement gain score was computed using results from the California Achievement Test. The researchers reported a curvilinear relationship between site-based management participations and student achievement. Achievement was found to correlate only moderately with site-based management mean scores. According to Weiss (1993), teachers expressed frustration that the process gave only a semblance of authority while real authority remained securely anchored in the principal's office.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Site-Based Management

The process of site-based management brought with it advantages and disadvantages. One advantage was that site councils were a natural extension of the democratic principle that everyone should have an opportunity to be heard. Another advantage was a larger number of alternates could be generated and analyzed when more people are involved. Site-based management made teachers feel empowered. It potentially improved the quality of decisions and increased the acceptance and implementation of decisions. Site-based management strengthened staff morale,

commitment and teamwork. It built trust and helped staff and administrators acquire new skills to increase school effectiveness (Liontos, 1991, 1993).

Disadvantages of site-based management weighed just as much as the advantages. Some teachers complained that suggestions or ideas presented in the group had not been taken seriously. For example one group was asked to interview a prospective new employee as part of its site-based management policy. The administrator without the consideration of the group's input hired a new applicant. Contrary to expectations that the inclusion of teachers in making decisions would be effective was the fact that some are not. The theory that site-based management led to improved student achievement remained a question in the minds of some local educators as well as national educational organizations. Another disadvantage lay in the possibility that participants should not judge site-based management in terms of any of its goals, but simply allow the process to absorb time, energy and serve no good purpose.

METHODOLOGY

Study Population

The subjects in this study were teachers in four secondary schools in South Mississippi. The study sample was comprised of approximately 203 teachers representing four school districts in South Mississippi. Approximately one hundred teachers were from site-based managed schools and approximately one hundred were from non-site-based managed schools. Two of the schools were site-based managed schools and two were non-site-based managed schools. The subjects were administered a researcher designed instrument in the fall of 2001.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The instrument for this study was administered to teachers in the fall of 2001. Permission was secured from the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee and superintendents of the selected schools to administer the researcher designed instrument. The researcher also secured permission to administer the instrument from individual principals of the selected schools. The instrument was distributed at faculty meetings or to teachers' mailboxes at the selected schools. The researcher confirmed a date with each principal for picking up the completed instruments.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in the study was a researcher-designed instrument on teacher self- efficacy. It is a 24-item instrument with five subscales: efficacy to influence curriculum practices, efficacy to influence school resources, efficacy to influence instructional practices, efficacy to influence disciplinary procedures, and demographics. Each of the appropriate items is measured on a 5-point scale anchored with the indicators of strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree and strongly agree. Specific directions for the respondent are listed on the first page of the instrument. The instructions for rating items appear at the top of the page. There is no time limit for completing the instrument. Teachers can usually complete the instrument in ten to fifteen minutes.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability of the instrument was established by Cronbach alpha measures. The Cronbach alpha reliabilities for the scores were as follows: school resources .7435, instruction .7477, and discipline .7258. For curriculum practices, the alpha for both groups together was .426. The alpha for site-based only was .83. For non-site-based

without question 4, the alpha was .846. The total alpha for all variables was .77. A panel of experts comprised of a principal, a teacher and a university professor established validity of the instrument.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Descriptive Statistics for the Sample

The raw scores from the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale were used to compute the data presented in Chapter IV. The study sample was comprised of 203 teachers representing four schools in Mississippi. Two of the schools were located in one school district and employed teachers under the non-site-based school managed model. The organizational structure of the non-site-based school model is decision-making by the district central offices and the principal of the school in such areas as curriculum, school resources, instruction and discipline. The other schools were located in different school districts and employed teachers under the site-based managed school model. The organizational structure of the site-based managed school model shifts decision-making authority from district central offices to individual school site principals and teachers. This occurs in such areas as curriculum, school resources, instruction and discipline. All four schools in this study were secondary schools with similar characteristics in physical plant and student population. One hundi [35] ghteen teachers from site-based managed schools and eighty-five teachers from non-site-based managed schools completed the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale during faculty meetings.

Table 1 shows the age, years of experience, and years teaching at present school of teachers in the site-based managed schools and teachers in the non-site-based managed schools. In regards to the years at present school variable, it should be noted that the high

standard deviations, in relation to the means, are the result of a wide range of years at the present school for both groups.0

Table 1
Age, Years of Experience, and Years at Present School Site-Based and Non-Site-Based Schools

Variable	Site-Based		Non-Site-Based	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Age	44.64	8.63	44.62	9.69
Yrs. of Exp.	16.43	9.04	16.24	10.25
Yrs. Present Sch.	8.67	7.56	9.34	8.06

Table 2 shows that there were more female teachers than male teachers employed in both site-based and non-site-based managed schools. However, there was no significant difference in percentage of each gender at site-based managed and non-site-based managed schools as evidenced by a Chi Square (N=188, df=1) of 2.20, p=.138.

Table 2
Gender of Teachers in Site-Based and Non-Site-Based Schools

Gender	Site-Based	Non-Site-Based	Total
Female	79 (71.8%)	48 (61.5%)	127 (67.6%)
Male	31 (28.2%)	30 (38.5%)	61 (32.4%)

Table 3 shows a comparison of the level of degrees held by teachers at site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools. The percentages of teachers holding a Bachelors degree, in both groups were within one percentage point of each other. The percentage of teachers holding a Masters degree in site-based schools was four percent higher than teachers in the non-site-based schools. The percentage of teachers holding a Specialist degree in site-based schools was one percent and the

percentage of teachers holding a Specialist degree in non-site-based schools was four percent. Cumulatively there was no difference in the educational levels of the teachers in the two groups.

Table 3
Educational Levels of Teachers in Site-Based and Non-Site-Based Schools

Degree	Site-Based	Non-Site-Based
Bachelors	46 (47.9%)	34 (46.9%)
Masters	51 (52.0%)	34 (47.9%)
Specialist	1 (1.0%)	3 (4.2%)

Table 4 shows a comparison of the grade levels and subject area assignments of teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools. Grade level assignments ranged from grades 9-12 and subject area assignments in both site-based and non-site-based schools provided a varied, but similar curriculum.

Table 4
Grade Levels and Subject Area Assignments of Site-Based and Non-Site-Based Teachers

Grade Level	Site-Based	Non-Site-Based
9th	12 (12.4%)	2 (2.6%)
10th	6 (6.2%)	3 (3.9%)
11th	8 (8.2%)	4 (5.2%)
12th	71 (88.3%)	68 (73.2%)
Subject Area		
History	12 (10.0%)	7 (8.3%)
Perf/Fine Arts	9 (7.4%)	5 (5.9%)
Science	10 (8.4%)	11 (13.0%)
Foreign Lang.	5 (5.1%)	2 (2.4%)
English	16 (13.4%)	10 (11.8%)
Health/PE/Dr. Ed.	3 (2.5%)	8 (9.4%)
Voc/Tech/Business	11 (9.3%)	8 (9.5%)
ROTC	1 (.8%)	3 (3.5%)
Math	16 (13.4)	12 (14.1%)
Sp. Ed.	9 (7.6%)	7 (8.2%)

In relation to teacher self-efficacy, the data computed in table 5 showed that teachers at site-based managed schools had slightly higher means for each variable on the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale. Standard deviations for each variable were in the acceptable range. The total scale results for teacher self-efficacy showed a mean of 4.0165 for site-based managed schools and a standard deviation of .5177. The mean score for the non-site-based managed schools was 3.6382 and the standard deviation was .5583. According to this data overall, teacher self-efficacy was slightly higher among the teachers in site-based schools represented in this study.

Table 5
Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on Curriculum, School Resources, Instruction, and Discipline at Site-Based Managed Schools and Non-Site-Based Managed Schools

Variable	Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Curriculum	SBM	3.581	.8846	118
	NSB	3.5294	1.3559	85
Resources	SBM	3.4103	.7945	118
	NSB	2.6049	.8257	85
Instruction	SBM	4.5184	.5575	118
	NSB	4.3559	.5858	85
Discipline	SBM	4.2119	.5814	118
	NSB	3.9782	.5157	85
Self-Efficacy	SBM	4.0165	.5177	118
	NSB	3.6382	.5583	85

Tests of Hypotheses

The multiple linear regression model was used to analyze hypotheses 1 through 6.

Test of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differed in relation to influence on curriculum. For the purpose of this study, influence on school curriculum was defined as

influence on selection of content, topics and skills to be taught; influence on selection of textbooks, and other materials utilized at school; influence on decisions regarding curriculum and expression of opinions regarding curriculum matters.

Table 6 contains the data from the computation of scores using the multiple linear regression model. The probability level of F (1, 201)=4.360, p=. 038, R^2 =.021 indicated that there was a significant difference in the curriculum variable among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools. Based on this result, Hypothesis 1 was accepted. Teachers at site-based managed schools had greater influence on curriculum than teachers in non-site-based managed schools.

Table 6
Computation of Data Relative to Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on Curriculum

	Sum of Sq.	df	M Sq.	F	Sig.	R^2
Model 1						
Regression	5.336	1	5.336	4.360	.038	.021
Residual	245.986	201	1.224			
Total	252.323	202				

Test of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differed in relation to influence on school resources.

For the purpose of this study, school resources were defined as site affairs concerning budget matters, instructional materials and classroom equipment. Table 7 contains data from the computation of scores using the multiple linear regression model. The results were $F(1, 202) = 50.033$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .199$. Based on the results,

Hypothesis 2 was accepted. Teachers in site-based managed schools had a greater influence on school resources than teachers in non-site-based managed schools.

Table 7
Computation of Data Relative to Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on School Resources

	Sum of Sq.	df	M Sq.	F	Sig.	R^2
Model 1						
Regression	32.561	1	32.561	50.033	.000	.199
Residual	131.460	202	.651			
Total	164.021	203				

Test of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differed in relation to influence on instruction. The results of the data in Table 8 were $F(1, 202) = 3.820$, $p = .05$, $R^2 = .019$. Based on the results, Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Table 8
Computation of Data Relative to Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on Instruction

	Sum of Sq.	df	M Sq.	F	Sig.	R^2
Model 1						
Regression	1.240	1	1.240	3.820	.052	.019
Residual	65.551	202	.325			
Total	66.791	203				

Test of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differed in relation to influence on disciplinary procedures. For the purpose of this study, disciplinary procedures were defined as rules and consequences involving behavior policy.

The results of the data in table 9 were $F(1, 202)=8.949$, $R^2=.042$, $p=.003$. Based on the results indicated in table 9, Hypothesis 4 was accepted. Teachers in site-based managed schools had greater influence on disciplinary procedures than teachers in non-site-based managed schools.

Table 9
Computation of Data Relative to Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on Discipline

	Sum of Sq.	df	M Sq.	F	Sig	R^2
Model 1						
Regression	2.743	1	2.743	8.949	.003	.042
Residual	61.921	202	.307			
Total	64.664	203				

Test of Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differed in relation to age and gender. The results of the data in table 10 were $F(3, 171)=5.125$, $R^2=.082$, $p=.002$. Hypothesis 5 was accepted. Data in table 11 indicated that age and gender were not significant predictors of teacher self-efficacy. Only site-based managed groups versus non-site-based managed groups showed evidence of significance.

Table 10
Computation of Data Relative to Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on Age and Gender

	Sum of Sq.	df	M Sq.	F	Sig.	R^2
Model 1						
Regression	4.310	3	1.437	5.125	.002	.082
Residual	47.936	171	.280			
Total	52.245	174				

Table 11
Computation of Data Relative to Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on Group, Age, and Gender

		Beta	Sig.
Model 1			
	Group	-.278	.000
	Age	-.032	.660
	Gender	-.039	.559

Test of Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 stated: Teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools differed in relation to educational degrees, years of teaching experience, years of teaching at present school, and grade level assignment. The results of the data in table 12 were $F(6,149)=2.999$, $R^2=.108$, $p=.009$. Hypothesis 6 was accepted. Data in table 13 indicated that educational degrees, years of teaching experience, years of teaching at present school and grade level assignment were not significant predictors of teacher self-efficacy. Only site-based managed groups versus non-site-based managed groups showed evidence of significance.

Table 12
Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on Grade Level, Years of Experience, Years at Present School and Degree

	Sum of Sq.	df	M Sq.	F	Sig.	R^2
Model 1						
Regression	5.458	6	.910	2.999	.009	.108
Residual	45.193	149	.303			
Total	50.651	155				

Table 13

Data Relative to Teacher Self-Efficacy and Influence on Group, Degree, Years of Experience, Years at Present School and Grade

		Beta	Sig.
Model 1			
	Group	-.318	.000
	Degree	-.077	.333
	Experience	-.093	.353
	Present	-.001	.993
	Grade	.043	.588

Ancillary Findings

Informal interviews with teachers and notes written on the returned instruments revealed several unanticipated findings:

(a) Some teachers were not familiar with the concept of site-based managed schools versus non-site-based managed schools.

(b) Some teachers felt intimidated by possible negative reactions from the principal and did not complete the demographics section of the instrument.

(c) Some teachers felt that too much accountability rests on the shoulders of only a few teachers at their school.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

The testing of the six hypotheses derived major findings of the study. The findings associated with each of the tested hypotheses were as indicated in the following results.

Hypothesis 1 stated: There was a significant difference in teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools relative to influence on curriculum. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was accepted.

Hypothesis 2 stated: There was a significant difference in teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools relative to influence on school resources. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

Hypothesis 3 stated: There was no significant difference in teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools relative to influence on instruction. Instructional practices were not tied to site-based management; they were tied to internalization of the teachers. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Hypothesis 4 stated: There was a significant difference in teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools relative to influence on disciplinary procedures. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was accepted.

Hypothesis 5 stated: There was a significant difference in teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools relative to age and gender. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was accepted.

Hypothesis 6 stated: There was a significant difference in teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based managed schools relative to educational degrees, years of teaching experience, years of teaching at present school, and grade level assignment. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was accepted.

Conclusions

The debate of how to best educate students has remained a burning issue for many years. After the publication of A Nation At Risk in 1983, school systems strived to improve and reform their institutions. Decentralization was one such reform effort. The purpose of this study was to investigate whether teacher self-efficacy and site-based management in schools could be used as a decentralization strategy.

The study examined whether there was a difference in teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and teachers in non-site-based managed schools. The analysis of the data showed that teachers in site-based managed schools had a higher level of teacher self-efficacy than teachers in non-site-based managed schools. A second purpose of this study was to examine whether there was a difference among teachers in site-based managed schools and teachers in non-site-based managed schools relative to influence on curriculum, school resources, instruction, and disciplinary practices. Analysis of the data showed that there was a significant difference in teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based managed schools and teachers in non-site-based managed schools relative to influence on the variables of curriculum, school resources, and disciplinary procedures. There was not a significant difference in teacher self-efficacy among the teachers relative to influence on the variable of instruction. The researcher expected this result because instructional practices were not tied to site-based management. More accurately, they were tied to internalization of the teachers. The analysis of the data also showed that gender, degree, and years of experience did not make a difference relative to teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based schools

and non-site-based schools. The application of the site-based management process makes the difference.

The results of this study obtained by administration of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale concurred with findings reported in the review of the literature. According to Goens (1996) site-based management involved shifting the decision-making closer to those who educated the students. Site-based management improved teacher performance and thereby the ultimate goal of increased student learning. Jones (1997) suggested that site-based management lead to more effective organizations and higher staff morale. Research by Riggs and Enochs (1990) reported that teacher with high levels of teacher self-efficacy anticipated they would be successful. Researchers Gibson and Dembo (1984) reported that the higher a teacher's sense of efficacy, the more successful the teacher would be in promoting student achievement. Teachers employed in site-based managed schools in this study, reflected characteristics of those in the review of the literature.

Implications for Educational Administrators

Educational administrators and others interested in the reform of the educational systems constantly search for means of increasing student achievement. Based upon review of the literature and significant findings of this study, teacher self-efficacy and site-based-management may serve as an effective strategy for improving schools and thereby, increasing student achievement.

Teacher self-efficacy is an important element in effecting positive change in student learning. Dembo and Gibson (1985) reported that the extent to which teachers believe that they could affect student learning influenced teacher/student interactions and

the success of teachers' effort in facilitating gains in student achievement. Researchers such as Morin and Welsh (1991) corroborated the importance of teacher self-efficacy. They reported that educators with high teacher efficacy engaged in activities that encouraged the development of competencies. They also reported that teachers with low self-efficacy avoided engaging in those activities. Teachers who believed student learning could be influenced by their own teaching abilities, persisted longer, provided a greater academic focus in the classroom, and exhibited different types of feedback than those teachers who had lower expectations concerning their ability to influence student learning. (Gibson and Dembo, 1994).

Site-based management stressed the premise that those closest to students knew best how to effect improvement in academic performance. Dunnett, Campbell, and Hakel (1967) connected school improvement to teachers. These researchers believed that hiring high quality teachers and those who were motivated as well as prepared for the teaching task was crucial. According to a study done by Liontos (1993) site-based management had the potential of improved decision-making; increased acceptance and implementation of decisions; strengthened staff morale, commitment, and teamwork; built trust, helped staff and administrators acquire new skills; and increased school effectiveness. Additionally, the process also helped staff gain understanding of management complexities, and principals learned to respect faculty judgment.

Recommendations

Recommendations for future study include the following:

1. Increase in the number of school districts in one state and expansion of studies to multiple states to determine if the results remain consistent.

2. Investigate a school designated as non-site-based and administer the instrument. Implement site-based management at the same designated school several years later. Administer the instrument again and examine the results.

3. Investigate teacher self-efficacy and site-based management relative to quantifiable increase in student achievement.

Recommendations for use of this study:

Educational administrators and others may use information from this study in hiring practices, planning for staff development, improving student achievement and in examining current district policy on school reform strategies. Findings of note include:

1. Overall teacher self-efficacy is higher in site-based managed schools than in non-site-based managed.

2. Site-based management allows teachers to have input into the organization of the school and thereby, feel ownership in the school.

3. The higher the level of teacher self-efficacy the more teachers feel that they can impact student learning.

4. The gender, degree, and years of experience do not make a difference in teacher self-efficacy. It is the element of site-based management that makes the difference.

Overall, findings from this study indicated that teacher self-efficacy in site-based managed schools was better in relation to five of the six hypotheses presented. The findings also indicated that gender, degree and years of experience do not make a difference relative to teacher self-efficacy among teachers in site-based schools and non-site-based schools. In spite of all of the other variables involved in the study, it is the

administration of the site-based management process that makes a difference between teachers in site-based managed schools and non-site-based schools.

TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS: The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information regarding the attitudes of teachers concerning their beliefs about the statements listed below. Please circle the appropriate number to indicate your response to each statement. Your responses will remain confidential.

1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=undecided 4=agree 5=strongly agree

CURRICULUM PRACTICES

1. I can influence the selection of content, topics and skills to be taught at school. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I can influence the selection of textbooks and other materials utilized at school. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I can influence decisions about curriculum changes at school. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I can openly express my opinions regarding curriculum matters in the school. 1 2 3 4 5

SCHOOL RESOURCES

5. I can influence matters concerning the budget at the school. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I can order materials for the classroom when needed. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I can usually get classroom equipment when needed. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I can get fees paid in order to attend conferences and workshops. 1 2 3 4 5

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

9. I am comfortable teaching the subject area(s) to which I am assigned. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I can motivate students to learn. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I can implement a variety of teaching strategies to help students learn. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I can provide appropriate challenges for all students that I teach. 1 2 3 4 5

DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

13. I can influence the school site discipline policy. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I can establish a classroom management plan. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I can get students to follow classroom and school rules. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I can respond appropriately when a student is defiant. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I can get help with student discipline from administrators. 1 2 3 4 5

DEMOGRAPHICS

18. Age _____
19. Gender _____
20. Years of teaching experience _____
21. Years teaching at present school _____
22. Subject area assignment _____
23. Grade level assignment _____
24. Degree _____

REFERENCES

Ashton, P., (1984). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teachers education. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(5), 28-32.

Bandura, A., (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A., (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. Psychology Review, 84, 191-215.

Brooks, Jacqueline, (2001). Teachers and students: Constructivists forging new connections. Educational Leadership, 47 (5) 68-71.

Center for education reform (1998). A nation at risk: an education manifesto retrieved June 23, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://www.edreform.com/pubs/manifest.html.

Cohen, D. (1989). What standards for national standards? Phi Delta Kappan 76, 751. Retrieved April 20, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://proquest.um.com.

Darling-Hammond, Linda (1997). School reform at the crossroads: Confronting central issues of teaching. Educational Policy, 11, 151-166.

David, Jane L. (1989a). Synthesis of research on school based management. Educational Leadership 46 (8), 45-53.

David, Jane L. (1995b). Site-based management: Making it work. Retrieved June 18, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://www.ascd.org/pub/el/dec;an/david.html.

David, Jane L. (1995/1996c). The who, what and why of site-based management. Educational Leadership, 53, 4-9.

Deal, Terrence E., Peterson, Kent D. (1990). The Principal's Role In Shaping School Culture. Office of Education Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C. (ED325914).

Deal, Terrence, E., Peterson, Kent D. (1999). Shaping School Culture. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Drury, Darrel, Levin, Douglas. (1994). School-based Management: The Changing Locus Of Control In American Public Education. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and improvement.

Dunnette, M. D., Campbell, J. P., and Hakil, M. D. (1967). Factors contributing to job dissatisfaction in six occupational groups. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, (2), 143-174.

Enderlin-Lampre, Scheerie (1997). Shared decision-making in schools: Effect on teaching. Education, (118), 1, 150-157.

Finn, Chester E., Rebarber, Theodor. (1992). Education Reform in the '90s. Macmillan Publishing Company.

Fullan, Michael. (1998). Leadership for the 21st century: Breaking the bonds of dependency. Retrieved June 9, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://www.ascd/org.pubs.el.april98

Geons, George E. (1996). Shared decision, empowerment, and ethics. The School Administrator 54 (9), 12-14.

Gibson, S. & Dembo, M. W. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, (94), 569-582.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., and Ross-Gordon, J. M. (1998). Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Heckman, Paul E. (1993). School restructuring in practice: Reckoning with culture of school. International Journal of Educational Reform, 263-71.

Jones, R.E. (1997). Teacher participation in its relationship to staff morale and student achievement. Education, 118, 76-83.

Lashway, Larry. (1999). Trends and issues: School reform. Retrieved January 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://eric.uoregon.edu/issues/reform.index.html.

Liontos, Lynn Balster. (1994). Shared decision-making. Retrieved January 18, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest.087.html.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., and Krantz (1990). Site- based management: Unfulfilled Promises. The School Administrator. (47) 2, 30, 32, 53-56, 59.

Mark, G. E., Hunter, D. D., and Johnson, C. D. (1997). Increasing student achievement: an urban district's search for success. Urban Education 31 (5), 529-544.

Miller, Edward. (1995). Shared decision-making by itself doesn't make for better decisions. The Harvard Education Newsletter 9 (6), 1-4.

Morin, S. M. & Welsh, L. A. (1991). Teaching efficacy scale: Job analysis and theoretical issues. ERIC, ED 342740.

Murphy, J. A. (1990). Improving the education of at risk students. Systems of check and balances. Upper Marlboro, M.D.: Prince George County Public Schools (ED 325 539).

Naring, H. L. (1990). Beginning teacher's perceptions of their proficiency in teaching skills. ERIC ED 328515.

North Central Regional Education Laboratory (NCREL). (1993). Decentralization: Why, how, and toward what end? North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Report 1 1993. Retrieved June 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/go/93-lsite.htm1

Odden, Eleanor, R., and Wohlstetter, Priscilla (1995). Educational Leadership 52 (5), 14-17.

Peterson, Brian. (1991) How school-based management is fairing in Miami. Education Week (10) 38, 26.

Proctor, C. (1984). Teacher expectations: A model for school improvement. The Elementary School Journal, 469-481.

Purkey, Stewart C., Smith, Marshall S. (1992). Effective Schools – A Review. Paper presented at the National Invitational Conference, Warrenton, VA. (ED 218 257).

Riggs, I. M., & Enochs, L. G. (1990). Toward the development of an elementary teacher's science teaching efficacy belief instrument. Science Education, 74(6), 625-637.

Ross, J. A. (1994). The impact of an in-service to promote cooperative rearing on the stability of teacher efficacy. Teaching and Teacher Education, 10, (4), 381-94.

Sergiovanni, T. J., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F. & Thurston, P. W. (1992). Education governance and administration. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Summers, A. A. and Johnson, A. A. (1995). Doubts about decentralized decisions: research questions positive conversation between site-based management and student outcomes. The School Administrator, 52 (3) 24-26, 28, 30, 32.

Taylor, D. D. and Bogotch, L. E. (1994). School-level effects of teacher's participation in decision-making. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16 (3), 302-319.

Thomas, B. J. (1995). Teachers Opinions About Decision Making Since Chicago School Reform 1988. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. E0035817).

Weiss, C. H. (1993). Shared decision making about what? A comparison of schools with and without teacher participation. Teacher's College Record, 95 (1), 69-93.

Weiss, Carol H, Cambone, Joseph, and Wyeth, Alexander (1992). Trouble in paradise: teacher conflicts in shared decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly (28), 3, 350-67.

White, Paula. (1989). An overview of school based management: What does the research pay? NASSP Bulletin 73, 518.

Wohlsetetter, P. (1995). Making school-based management work. Educational Leadership, 52, 32-36.

Wohlstetter, Priscilla, Van Kirk, Amy N., Robertson, Peter J. and Mohiman, Susan A. (1997). Organizing for successful school based management. Educational Leadership.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Teacher Self-Efficacy and Site-Based Management as a Decentralization Strategy	
Author(s): Catherine E. Neukirk and Jack Klotz	
Corporate Source: Mid South Educational Research Association Annual Meeting	Publication Date: November 6-8, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Jack Klotz	Printed Name/Position/Title: Jack Klotz, Associate Professor	
Organization/Address: University of Central Arkansas, Torreyson Library - 301, Conway, AR 72035-0001	Telephone: 501 450-5209	FAX: 501 450-5339
	E-Mail Address: jklotz@mail.uca.edu	Date: 11-8-02

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)